meant only for eliciting further information and not for cross-examining officers of Government on the floor of the House. If this point were borne in mind in asking questions, all available information would be furnished and any details which might be required but are not readily available would be obtained and furnished.

One of the suggestions made by Mr. Hanumanthiah was that the Ministers themselves should answer all questions. The procedure in the past was for only the Secretaries to Government and the Heads of Departments to answer all of them, though in the case of Representations, the Dewan or the Member of Council concerned gave the final replies. But the suggestion made by the member would be noted and the Ministers would have no objection to give replies themsleves as far as possible.

With reference to the point that answers to questions were not being furnished in serial order, **The PRESIDENT** observed that there was reason for it. Some of the questions could be answered with the information readily available in the Secretariat itself. But in respect of others—and they formed a large number—information would have to be obtained from the Heads of Departments concerned, who in their turn would have to call for it from their subordinate officers and, in some cases, from the taluks. That would necessarily take time. In such cases, there would be delay in furnishing answers which could not be avoided in the circumstances.

**Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY** said that questions were being sent to the office fifty days before the commencement of the session. So, even if information was to be collected from various places and officers, sufficient time would be available. If therefore, the Government made efforts to answer all the questions in an order, it would be a source of immense satisfaction to the members.

**The PRESIDENT** said that was all right as a general proposition. But if a question called for elaborate statistics pertaining to a long series of years, it would naturally take time for the statistics to be compiled. It could not be answered off-hand consistently with Government's responsibility. If incomplete answers were furnished, they could not be of any practical use to the members themselves. Also, in many cases, it was difficult for Government to know why a particular question had been put in a particular way. If at least the object underlying a question could be ascertained, useful information might be furnished to the satisfaction of the members concerned.

**Mr. S. N. M. RAZVI** suggested that answers to questions which could not be furnished during a particular session be sent to them by post as soon as possible after the close of the session. That would obviate the necessity of the same questions being put at successive sessions.

**The PRESIDENT** observed that answers to all questions were being included in the printed proceedings. He suggested that if a sort of a Study Circle were formed by the members, they could usefully discuss things in advance and the business of the House could also be gone through more expeditiously and satisfactorily.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—*contd.*

### Transfers of Police Officers Once in Three Years.

*Q.*—115. **Mr. BHOGAPPA** (Gundlupet—Rural).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) how many years once are transfers of Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors effected in the Police Department ;

(*b*) whether it has come to the notice of Government that some Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors are not transferred even though they remain in the same place for five or six years ;

(*c*) whether the District Police Officers have been retained for many years in the same place ; and if so, in what districts ?

*A.*—**The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT** (**Rajasevaprasakta B. T. Kesavaiengar**).—

(*a*) and (*b*) No hard and fast rule has been laid down, but generally speaking, Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors can expect transfer from a charge after three years, unless special circumstances necessitate a change earlier. The names of officers who have remained in one district for five years or more at a stretch are noted and they are transferred to another district as soon as practicable.

(*c*) In the following districts, District Police Officers have remained in the same districts from the dates noted against them :—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bangalore | ... ... | 7-7-1936 |
| Mysore | ... ... | 11-7-1936 |
| Bangalore City... | ... | 3-5-1938 |

**Mr. BHOGAPPA.**—With reference to answer to (*a*) and (*b*), at what intervals are the officers expected to be transferred ?

**Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.**—As soon as possible after three years.

**Mr. BHOGAPPA.**—In the answer, it is stated that no hard and fast rule has been laid down as regards transfers of officers. Why should not the three-year rule relating to transfers be strictly enforced in the case of officers of the Police Department as is being done in all other departments of Government ?

**Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.**—Even in the other departments, the rule is not meant to be enforced invariably. The general understanding is that they should not be transferred within three years, but that does not mean that there should be a transfer in every case immediately after the three-year limit is over.

**Mr. BHOGAPPA.**—Is it not desirable to lay it down that once in three years, every officer must be transferred ?

**Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.**—Government do not think so.

**Mr. BHOGAPPA.**—Is there any harm in making such a rule ?

**Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.**—There may be no harm, but there may be practical difficulties. Even if such a rule is passed, it might have to be violated in some cases.

**Mr. BHOGAPPA.**—At least as a general rule, will the Government transfer officers once in three years ?

**Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.**—I have already said that as far as possible it is being done.

**Mr. K. NANJUNDA RAO.**—With reference to answer (*c*), what are the reasons for retaining those officers in Bangalore, Mysore and Bangalore City for more than three years ?

**Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.**—There are various reasons ; efficiency of officers, local conditions, etc.

**Mr. K. NANJUNDA RAO.**—Then, how long are those officers going to be retained in their present places ?

**Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.**—It is not possible to say.

**Mr. T.M. KHAN.**—If an officer is doing good work and is really serviceable to the people of the locality, is it not desirable to keep him in the same place even after the three-year limit ?

**Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.**—It may be.

**The MINISTER for REVENUE and FINANCE** (**Rajamantrapravina K. V. Anantaraman**).—There are instances of representatives of the people themselves urging for the retention of certain officers in the same place for some more time.

## Refund of Fines levied from Satyagrahis.

*Q.*—114. **Mr. Bandi NARANAPPA** (Sidlaghatta—Rural).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) how many Satyagrahis were punished with fines in the Gold Mine Satyagraha started by the Mysore Congress in the month of September 1939 and onwards ;

(*b*) from how many persons fines were recovered ;

(*c*) whether any order has been issued by Government to refund the fines collected in this respect ?

(*d*) if so, whether they will place a copy of the order on the table ?

*A.*—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, LAW DEPARTMENT** (**Mr. H. V. Narayana Rao**).—

(*a*) 314 Satyagrahis were sentenced to pay fines.